Exhibit H

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ALEXIS LUCENTE, on behalf of * Case No. 23-CV-3560(SIL)

herself and others similarly *

situated,

Plaintiff, * Long Island Federal

* Courthouse

* 100 Federal Plaza

Central Islip, NY 11722

EAD ENTERTAINMENT, LLC, * November 7, 2024

et al.,

Defendants.

*

*

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEVEN I. LOCKE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

v.

For the Plaintiff: GARRETT KASKE, ESQ.

JEFFREY MAGUIRE, ESQ. 534 Broadhollow Road Melville, NY 11747

For the Defendants: CAROLYN PELLEGRINI, ESQ.

Saul Ewing LLP Centre Square West 1500 Market Street

Philadelphia, PA 19102

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc. Shelton, CT 06484 (203)732-6461

```
3
 1
                  MR. KASKE: Yes, Your Honor. The value of the
 2
        recovery would go up if there were no --
 3
                  THE COURT:
                             To what?
                  MR. KASKE: -- notice claims.
 4
                  So the value --
 5
                  THE COURT: Approximately.
 6
 7
                  MR. KASKE: We attributed the damages for the
 8
        notice claims was $312,000.
 9
                  THE COURT: Right. And if you get rid of that --
10
                  MR. KASKE: That's about 30 percent of the --
11
                  THE COURT: So 28 percent becomes 50-something
12
        percent?
13
                  MR. KASKE: Yes, Your Honor.
14
                  THE COURT: Okay. Would you agree that you may
15
        have some trouble with the 195 claims in light of the Second
        Circuit's decision in Guthrie?
16
17
                  MR. KASKE: Yes, Your Honor.
18
                  THE COURT: Do you know what I'm talking about?
19
                  MR. KASKE: Yes. I would say that I think Guthrie
20
        did clarify that the easy way out for plaintiffs in those
21
        claims is taken away, but also the standard that some judges
22
        were holding plaintiffs to isn't as high.
23
                  So, yes, we would have to show that there was some
24
        harm, but it's not as a high bar as some courts have set,
25
        fortunately. That is --
```

4 Spoken as a plaintiff's lawyer or --1 THE COURT: 2 MR. KASKE: Yes. That's fine. That's fine. 3 THE COURT: MR. KASKE: But you're right. A hundred percent we 4 would have to make a real showing that there was some sort of 5 harm both on the pleadings and then throughout the case to 6 maintain those claims in this courthouse. 7 8 THE COURT: Well, I appreciate that it may say that 9 in the pleadings, but I imagine at some point Ms. Pellegrini 10 would want to depose one or more of your clients so that they 11 could explain how they were harmed as a result of that, and 12 perhaps after those depositions those claims, which I'm sure 13 are adjusted in every complaint now, might not hold water, or 14 create a problem, certainly on a classwide basis. 15 MR. KASKE: Precisely. 16 THE COURT: And so I would have concerns about the 17 viability of those claims in any event, but they would only 18 seem to increase your application in this event. 19 MR. KASKE: Precisely, Your Honor. And so second 20 question. \$40,000 to the named plaintiff. I've never seen 2.1 \$40,000 to the named plaintiff before, have you? 22 MR. KASKE: Well, in large scale cases, yes. 23 it's not to the named plaintiff. It's to a group of 24 plaintiffs. 25 THE COURT: Oh. I'm sorry.